

## REMARKS

Claims 1-21 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Claims 1 and 18-21 have been amended to remove the “optionally” language. The Examiner is kindly requested to withdraw the rejection.

Claims 1-13 and 15-21 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Ireland. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The invention relates to a system and method for a computer architecture for distributed client/server systems. The system includes a multi-tier structure where the middle-layer is implemented as a microkernel. Clients of the first tier or layer send requests to servers of the third tier by use of messages which include a “message path” and a “token.” The message path identifies the server, the token includes the parameters to be passed to the server, and the server responds by a response message in order to transmit the result of the requested service to the client.

Ireland discloses a system in which a component transaction server provides a framework for deploying a middle-tier logic of distributed component-based applications. This system, although generally categorized in the same field of endeavor, fundamentally lacks a request message and response message that are physically separate from one another, as required by the claims. That is, Ireland fails to disclose that the messages are located in different physical address regions. If the request message and response message were physically identical (i.e. the same portion of memory passed from the client to the server, filled with the requested data by the server and passed back the client), the sending client would have to wait for the response from the server before being able to send a new request using the same message container. In the instant application, on the other hand, the message is passed to the microkernel, which passes the message to the server. The message is then read by the server and can be reused even before the server sends the response message. One slight problem results from this, namely, that the client receiving the response message that is physically separate from the request message must learn which request is being responded to by the response received. In order to accomplish this, the instant invention uses a timestamp to uniquely identify the request message. This feature is also recited in the claims, and can be found, for example, on page 10 lines 14-15 of the original English translation.

Since the recited structure and method are not disclosed by the applied prior art, claims 1-2 and 4-21 are patentable.

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Ireland in view of Helland. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the same reasons presented in the arguments above.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is solicited. Entry of this amendment after-final is appropriate since the claims were amended for the sole purpose of overcoming the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and incorporating claim 3 (now canceled) into the independent claims. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing, referencing Attorney Docket No. 118744-142.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP,

BY 

Kevin R. Spivak  
Reg. No. 43,148  
Customer No. 29177

Dated: August 16, 2007